

From: Woods, Clint [/O=EXCHANGELABS/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=BC65010F5C2E48F4BC2AA050DB50D198-WOODS, CLIN]
Sent: 6/11/2018 12:26:07 PM
To: Block, Molly [/o=ExchangeLabs/ou=Exchange Administrative Group (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/cn=Recipients/cn=60d0c681a16441a0b4fa16aa2dd4b9c5-Block, Moll]
Subject: Re: moment to chat?

Thanks!

Deliberative Process / Ex. 5

On Jun 11, 2018, at 8:06 AM, Block, Molly <block.molly@epa.gov> wrote:

Yes, thank you! Her question was on the use of science overall in the Administration. Here's what we sent her on Friday:

"The era of secret science at EPA is coming to an end," said EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt. **"The ability to test, authenticate, and reproduce scientific findings is vital for the integrity of rulemaking process. Americans deserve to assess the legitimacy of the science underpinning EPA decisions that may impact their lives."**

"As part of Administrator Pruitt's October 31st FACA directive, EPA sought a wider range of voices to weigh into the FACA selection processes. EPA was thrilled with the response of over 700 applicants and now has highly-qualified FACA boards that are independent and geographically diverse." EPA spokesman, Jahan Wilcox

BACKGROUND ...

On science transparency ...

- The proposed rule is in line with the scientific community's moves toward increased data sharing to address the "replication crisis," in which a significant proportion of published research may be false or not reproducible. Examples of the current data access provisions for authors publishing in major scientific journals:
 - Science: "All data used in the analysis must be available to any researcher for purposes of reproducing or extending the analysis."
 - Nature: "This policy builds upon our long-standing policy on data availability, which requires that authors make materials, data, code, and associated protocols promptly available to readers without undue qualifications. The preferred way to share large data sets is via public repositories."
 - Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences: "To allow others to replicate and build on work published in PNAS, authors must make materials, data, and associated protocols, including code and scripts, available to readers."

On NAAQS memo ...

- "A consequence of EPA's non-transparent National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) setting process (which the Administrator rectified last month), has been the establishment of some standards near background levels," said **Principal Scientist for Air Improvement Resource, Inc., and former Chairman of EPA's Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee (1992 – 1996) Dr. George Wolff**. "The policy ramifications of this have not been fully appreciated.

Setting the NAAQS at such low levels has also exacerbated unintended adverse impacts. The contributions to uncontrollable background levels and the nature of these adverse effects need to be better understood to inform policy making decisions. It is not only appropriate that CASAC be an integral part of these discussions, but it is also mandated by an often-overlooked section of the Clean Air Act.”

- “These NAAQS process reforms better separate scientific judgments from policy decisions,” **said former EPA Deputy Administrator (2005 – 2009) Marcus Peacock**. “Setting air quality standards is murky enough without muddying the distinctly different duties of scientists and political appointees in protecting human health and the environment.”

From: Woods, Clint

Sent: Monday, June 11, 2018 6:56 AM

To: Block, Molly <block.molly@epa.gov>

Subject: Re: moment to chat?

Was any of that provided to Coral?

On Jun 7, 2018, at 10:05 PM, Woods, Clint <woods.clint@epa.gov> wrote:

More on NAAQS Memo, let me know if I can help on the others:

The May 9 memorandum outlining a “Back-to-Basics” process for reviewing National Ambient Air Quality (NAAQS) ensures that EPA and its independent science advisors follow a transparent, timely, and efficient process in reviewing and revising public health- and welfare-based NAAQS. These reforms, advancing initiatives set out in President Trump’s April 12 Memorandum on Promoting Domestic Manufacturing and Job Creation – Policies and Procedures Relating to Implementation of Air Quality Standards, include incorporating important policy-relevant context, as required in the Clean Air Act, on issues like background pollution and potential adverse health, welfare, economic, energy, and social effects from strategies to attain and maintain the NAAQS.

Quotes from the accompanying press release

(<https://www.epa.gov/newsreleases/administrator-pruitt-signs-memo-reform-national-ambient-air-quality-standards-review>):

“A consequence of EPA’s non-transparent National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) setting process (which the Administrator rectified last month), has been the establishment of some standards near background levels,” **said Principal Scientist for Air Improvement Resource, Inc., and former Chairman of EPA’s Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee (1992 – 1996) Dr. George Wolff**. “The policy ramifications of this have not been fully appreciated. Setting the NAAQS at such low levels has also exacerbated unintended adverse impacts. The contributions to uncontrollable background levels and the nature of these adverse effects need to be better understood to inform policy making decisions. It is not only appropriate that CASAC be an integral part of these discussions, but it is also mandated by an often-overlooked section of the Clean Air Act.”

“I have been a participant and observer of the NAAQS review process since 1977 including serving as CASAC Chair and on Panels reviewing all of the criteria

pollutants. The process has continued to improve over the decades, however, serious issues still remain. I applaud key principles outlined in the memo,” **said Independent Advisor on Toxicology and Human Health Risk Assessment and former Chairman of EPA's Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee (1988 – 1992) Dr. Roger O. McClellan.** “It is appropriate to commit to meeting the statutory deadline of completing the review of each NAAQS every five years. Coordinating the Ozone and Particulate Matter reviews so they are completed close to each other, in October 2020 for Ozone and December 2020 for PM, should increase the efficiency and effectiveness of the process. The focus needs to be on the policy relevant information that will inform the policy decisions the CAA requires the Administrator to make.”
“These NAAQS process reforms better separate scientific judgments from policy decisions,” **said former EPA Deputy Administrator (2005 – 2009) Marcus Peacock.** “Setting air quality standards is murky enough without muddying the distinctly different duties of scientists and political appointees in protecting human health and the environment.”

On Jun 7, 2018, at 7:35 PM, Block, Molly <block.molly@epa.gov> wrote:

Clint should have some talkers on the NAAQS memo.

Sent from my iPhone

On Jun 7, 2018, at 7:33 PM, Wilcox, Jahan
<wilcox.jahan@epa.gov> wrote:

Can someone help answer these questions for me.

Begin forwarded message:

From: Coral Davenport
<coral.davenport@nytimes.com>
Date: June 7, 2018 at 5:19:32 PM
EDT
To: "Wilcox, Jahan"
<wilcox.jahan@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: moment to chat?

Awesome, thank you. If someone cld get back to me tonight or tomoro by like 10 am that would be perfect. Story is currently slated to run over the weekend.

Coral Davenport
Energy and Environment
Correspondent
The New York Times
Washington Bureau
1627 I St. NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20006
coral.davenport@nytimes.com

O 202-862-0359
C 703-618-0645
Twitter @CoralMDavenport

On Jun 7, 2018, at 5:14 PM, Wilcox, Jahan <wilcox.jahan@epa.gov> wrote:

What is your deadline? I am going to flag this for our policy shop and circle back.

From: Davenport, Coral
[<mailto:coral.davenport@nytimes.com>]

Sent: Thursday, June 7, 2018 3:53 PM

To: Wilcox, Jahan
<wilcox.jahan@epa.gov>

Subject: moment to chat?

Hi, Jahan,

I'm working on a story looking into concerns by the scientific community that the Trump administration is marginalizing and dismissing science. The story looks at examples from across the federal government, but many of them are at the E.P.A.

What are the administrator's responses to the following questions on this? Looking for fresh reax or would welcome your pointing me to specific remarks he's

made on these.
Overall, interested in his remarks on the allegation that he has reduced or ignored the role of science at the agency.

- Scientists are concerned that Mr. Pruitt has made multiple public statements on climate change that are at odds with decades of research on climate change, including research by the E.P.A.'s own scientists. Mr. Pruitt has said that carbon dioxide is not a primary contributor to global warming, and that scientists don't know how much humans contribute to global warming -- both statements that have been contested by the scientific community. What's his response?

- Critics say the proposed new "secret science" rule would ultimately have the impact of reducing the amount of scientific evidence that is used to formulate regulations that affect human health. Does this concern him?

- Can he speak to the criticism that in his efforts to change the Scientific Advisory Board, he has reduced

the role of academic science and replaced it with industry-funded scientists? And that even with its new composition, the SAB has proposed re-examining the scientific basis for some of his proposed rule-makings?

- Critics say Pruitt's NAAQs memo to the CASAC, which would order the committee to take economic impacts of regulations into account, is both an effort to skirt provisions of the Clean Air Act which require the committee to focus on the public health impacts of regulations, and could lead to looser pollution rules that are not based in scientific evidence on the impact of certain pollutants on human health.

Can you send answers to these and give a call to chat about the story?
Best,
Coral

--

Coral Davenport
Energy and
Environment
Correspondent

The New York Times
Washington Bureau
1627 I St. NW, Suite
700
Washington, DC
20006
coral.davenport@nytimes.com
O 202-862-0359
C 703-618-0645
Twitter
@CoralMDavenport